UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,326	06/14/2001	David B. Rozema	Mirus.013.02	1467

7590 12/31/2002

Mark K. Johnson
PO Box 510644
New Berlin, WI 53151-0644

EXAMINER
SANDALS, WILLIAM O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1636	10

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/881,326	Rozema et al.
Examiner	**Art Unit**
William Sandals	1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Oct 10, 2002* .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Amendments to the claims in Paper No. 9, filed October 10, 2002 have overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph in the previous office action, and the rejection is withdrawn.

2. Arguments filed in Paper No. 9 regarding the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The response to the arguments is contained in the rejection repeated below.

3. No arguments have been filed in Paper No. 9 regarding the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) and the rejection is sustained and repeated below.

4. No response to the double patenting rejection has been made. The rejection is repeated below.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686

F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,383,811 in view of US 5,698,531. Claims 13-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,383,811 are drawn to a process of delivering a polynucleotide to a blood vessel and then to an extravascular cell. The polynucleotide is delivered in a complex comprising the polynucleotide and a cationic polymer (such as PEI) where the charge on the complex is less negative than the charge on the polynucleotide, then expressing the polynucleotide in the extravascular cell. Claims 1-3 of the instant claimed invention are drawn to a process of delivering a polynucleotide/polymer complex which has a zeta potential less negative than the polynucleotide to an extravascular parenchymal cell, increasing the permeability of the blood vessel and expressing the polynucleotide in the

parenchymal cell. The polycation may have a pKa of 5-7 and the polymer may consist of imidazole groups, pyridine groups or aniline groups.

The instant specification states that PEI is a polymer which is well known in the prior art to have a pKa in the range of 5-7 at physiological pH. US 5,698,531 taught (see especially the abstract and columns 4-7) the obvious and desirable increasing of the permeability of a vessel to deliver a polynucleotide complex to the extravascular cells (parenchymal cells, as defined in the instant specification), making increasing the permeability of a vessel to deliver a polynucleotide complex to an extravascular parenchymal cell obvious .

7. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 09/447,966. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 09/447,966 are drawn to a process of delivering a polynucleotide to an extravascular parenchymal cell where the polynucleotide is in a complex with an amphipathic compound, inserting the complex into a blood vessel, increasing the permeability of the blood vessel to deliver the polynucleotide to an extravascular parenchymal cell and expressing the polynucleotide in the parenchymal cell. Claims 1-3 of the instant claimed invention are drawn to a process of delivering a polynucleotide in a complex with a polymer where the complex has a zeta potential less negative than the polynucleotide into a blood vessel, increasing the permeability of the blood vessel, delivering the

complex to an extravascular parenchymal cell and expressing the polynucleotide in the parenchymal cell.

8. The instant specification states that PEI is a polymer known in the prior art which may be used in to form the instant claimed polymer complex, and further states that PEI is an ampholite which is known in the prior art to have a pKa in the range of 5-7 at physiological pH.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,698,531.

US 5,698,531 taught (see especially the abstract and columns 4-7) a process for delivering a polynucleotide complexed with a polymer into an extravascular parenchymal cell of a mammal by mixing the polynucleotide and the polymer to form a complex, wherein the zeta potential of the complex is less negative than that of the polynucleotide alone at physiological pH. The complex is delivered into a mammalian vessel *in vivo*, the permeability of the vessel is

increased by increasing the pressure in the vessel, the complex passes through the vessel into the extravascular parenchymal cells and the polynucleotide is expressed.

Response to Arguments

11. Arguments filed in Paper No. 9, page 3, assert that US 5,698,531 is not enabled for delivery of polynucleotides to extravascular parenchymal cells. Support for this argument is based on an excerpt from the '531 patent at column 15, line 55, and excerpts from post-filing date, published articles authored by the inventors of the '531 patent.

The statement and arguments do not negate the very clear teachings of US 5,698,531 on delivery of polynucleotides to extravascular parenchymal cells found at column 3, lines 51-57, column 4, lines 12-24, lines 37-50, column 5, lines 15-14, column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 39, and the claims, and thus, the argument is not found convincing.

12. Arguments regarding "naked DNA" are not commensurate in scope with the instant claimed invention, and thus are moot.

13. It is further argued in Paper No. 9, page 5, that the specification of the '531 patent does not provide teachings "in a way that would allow a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the method. The mere mention of a possible method is not considered teaching the method."

In the specification of the '531 patent, at column 3, lines 51-57, column 4, lines 12-24, lines 37-50, column 5, lines 15-14, column 6, line 43 to column 7, line 39, and the claims, specific teachings are found on the process for delivering a polynucleotide complexed with a polymer into an extravascular parenchymal cell of a mammal by mixing the polynucleotide and

the polymer to form a complex, wherein the zeta potential of the complex is less negative than that of the polynucleotide alone at physiological pH. The complex is delivered into a mammalian vessel *in vivo*, the permeability of the vessel is increased by increasing the pressure in the vessel, the complex passes through the vessel into the extravascular parenchymal cells and the polynucleotide is expressed. Therefore, the argument is not found convincing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,698,531 in view of US 2001/0005717 A1.

The claims are drawn to a process for delivering a polynucleotide complexed with a polymer into an extravascular parenchymal cell of a mammal by mixing the polynucleotide and the polymer to form a complex, wherein the zeta potential of the complex is less negative than that of the polynucleotide alone at physiological pH. The complex is delivered into a mammalian vessel *in vivo*, the permeability of the vessel is increased by increasing the pressure in the vessel, the complex passes through the vessel into the extravascular parenchymal cells and

the polynucleotide is expressed. The polymer may have at least one functional group with a pKa in the range of 5-7 and may consist of imidazole, or pyridine or aniline groups.

US 5,698,531 taught the invention as described above in the rejection under 35 USC 102.

US 5,698,531 did not teach that the polymer may have at least one functional group with a pKa in the range of 5-7 and may consist of imidazole, or pyridine or aniline groups.

US 2001/0005717 A1 taught (see especially paragraphs 49-55, example 13 and figure 14) a process of delivering a polynucleotide complexed with a polymer which has functional groups with a pKa in the range of 5-7 consisting of imidazole groups and transfecting the polynucleotide through a vessel into the surrounding tissues (parenchyma) of the vessel where the permeability of the vessel has been increased.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of filing the instant application to combine the teachings of US 5,698,531 with US 2001/0005717 A1 because each of US 5,698,531 and US 2001/0005717 A1 teaches the use of a polymer complexed with a polynucleotide in a method of transfecting the polynucleotide through a vessel into the surrounding tissues (parenchyma) of the vessel where the permeability of the vessel has been increased. US 2001/0005717 A1 teaches the use of a polymer which has functional groups with a pKa in the range of 5-7 consisting of imidazole groups to increase the efficiency of the transfection.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of US 5,698,531 with US 2001/0005717 A1 because US 5,698,531 teaches the desirable and

beneficial introduction of the polynucleotide complex into a vessel by increasing the permeability of the vessel and US 2001/0005717 A1 teaches the desirable and beneficial introduction of the polynucleotide complex into a vessel by increasing the permeability of the vessel where the polymer has functional groups with a pKa in the range of 5-7 consisting of imidazole groups for the additional benefit of increasing the efficiency of the transfection. Further, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in the producing the instant claimed invention given the teachings of US 5,698,531 and US 2001/0005717 A1.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Certain papers related to this application are ***welcomed*** to be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The FAX numbers are (703) 308-4242 and 305-3014. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR 1.6(d)). NOTE: If applicant *does* submit a paper by FAX, the original copy should be retained by the applicant or applicant's representative, and the FAX receipt from your FAX machine is proof of delivery. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED, so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Dr. William Sandals whose telephone number is (703) 305-1982. The examiner normally can be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM, EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached at (703) 305-1998.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Tech Center customer service at telephone number is (703) 308-0198.

William Sandals, Ph.D.
Examiner
December 24, 2002

JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER